



-/-

SPW

Dr.-Ing. Giok Djien Go
Pfahlgrabenstr. 45
D-65510 Idstein
Germany

phone/fax +49 6126 8949

Registered

Mr. David R. Dunn
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3616

Jr.-Ing. Giok Djien Go
Pfahlgrabenstr. 45
D-65510 Idstein
Germany

Your OAS (E11) of 06/10/2005
10/690,742 "Anti-submarining seat-belt assembly"
Docket No.: G6A4

- (G1) My amended application of 03/24/2004, registered on 04/05/2004 by USPTO
- (G2) Mrs Draper's OAS (Office Action Summary) of 06/23/2004
- (G3) My letter of 08/06/2004 incl. the first amended application and drawings, registered on 09/02/2004 (?) by USPTO, to Mrs. Draper
- (G4) Your first OAS of 02/25/2005
- (G5) My 4-page objection of 04/12/2005, incl. my second amended application, to your OAS (G4) regarding the status and verdict
- (G6) Your Advisory Action of 04/26/2005; Deadline 10/26/2005
- (G7) My objection, faxed on 05/05, 16 and 17/ 2005, to Monages's invention (G6)
- (G8) My objection, faxed on 05/18/2005, to US 4,402,548
- (G9) Your amended claims, dated 05/24/ 2005, in regard with allowance.
- (G10) My response of 05/25/2005 to (G9)
- (G11) Your second OAS of 06/10/2005; Deadline 09/10/2005
- (G12) My response of 06/15/2005 to (G11) and request for mailing the US 5,257,854 (Korneliussen) document

Dear Mr. Dunn,

07/24/2005

Allow me please to list the sequence of references, you cited:

- 1 + 2) Despite having received twice (G3, G5) the shortcomings of Monages US 5,524,928 and read them you came to the following verdict on my invention. "*The examiner maintains that the rejections are proper*". Although you have received additional information regarding the shortcomings (G7) I had to explain you those ones during the phone call on May 16.
- 3) During the phone call on May 17 you cited another reference US 4,402,548 whose shortcomings I listed in (G8).
- 4) During another phone call and in (G11) you cited another reference US 5,257,854 which is infeasible, inapplicable and has nothing to do with preventing belt users from submarining! The problem cases, listed therein, are fictitious!! Please imagine how should millions of obese female Americans, (s. attached) wholly covering the female element of connector, be protected by that junk!

I thought at first the USPTO enjoy the highest esteemed reputation just like DPMA (German Patent Office) and EPO. Why has USPTO cited the references, which are the **three** greatest examples of junk, **five** times (G2, G4, G6, G8, G11) just for a **single** application. In contrary the

USPTO-G6A4;22.07.2005

examiners of DPMA, EPO and CIPO have cited references only in **one** examination report despite having examined a far larger number of applications, on which, below-mentioned, patent has already been granted.

CA 2,314,345 (nyp acronym for not yet printed), CA 2,249,667 (nyp), CA 2,313,780 (nyp), CA 2,220,872, CA 2,236,816, CA 2,230,721, CA 2,257,079
EP 0844939 B1, EP 0869 878 B1, EP 1 178 915 B9, EP 1 037 773 B1, EP 1 037 771 B1, EP 1147 029 B1
DE 196 15 985 C1, DE 196 36 167 C1, DE 197 11 392 C1, DE 195 49 378 C2, DE 196 55 051 C2, DE 196 55 146 C2, DE 195 49 379 C2, DE 197 49 780 C2, DE 197 58 497 C2, DE 197 58 498 C2,

I don't mind being confronted with any reference as long as it is feasible, applicable and far better than my application. Allow me please to cite the different opinion of Jane F. Garvey, Chairperson of FAA, and John Hammerschmidt, Chairman of NTSB, who wrote his verdict, word by word:

"...the seat belts that you have designed and that you suggest will provide a more effective passenger restraint system than the conventional ones, currently available in automobiles or aircraft"

After having thoroughly investigated my patents, incl. this appl. on which the EPO and the DPMA (German Patent Office) have already granted patent, and new directives and specifications, two FAA managers in USA as well as the FAA manager in Brussels [FAA/Brussels] suggest I submit all my directives and specifications to the U.S Department and Transportation. Not that junk, but my patents will save your life as well as lives world-wide in accidents.

Please question yourself, why you don't have the same opinion as your own countrymen, above-mentioned, who are really experts! I would appreciate if you would **not** treat me as a fool.

All the figures are absolutely correct:

- 1) You have offered me the allowance (G9), for sure, under the premise that the replacement- and annotated marked-up sheets (drawings) (G3) have absolutely complied with 37 CFR xx.
- 2) How can you otherwise cite other references US 4,402,548 and US 5,257,854 (G8, G12)?
- 3) Noteworthy, you have already reviewed all those figures and never raised objections within **nine months**, from 09/02/2004 to 06/10/2005.
- 4) Moreover, all of them are the original figures of US 09/554,463 to which Mrs Draper has **never** objected before she requested me to subdivide it into four apps. Only both last sheets 8/8, in which Figs. 12 to 14 are drawn, must be removed if this is your objection.
- 5) All your countrymen, above-mentioned, as well as Sir Nick Scheele, ex-Ford President, are capable of reading my drawings.

To meet your wish seven replacement sheets and seven annotated marked-up sheets are enclosed.

Both accident reports, cited in my appl., were already submitted to USPTO.

The reference US 5,257,854, you cited, has nothing to do with preventing belt users from submarining!

- a) You have modified the goal of the principle object (F3) and added new matters, as you did before. See D16 (G5). Why have you repeated them which absolutely violate the US patent rules?
- b) Moreover, the principle object, the goal thereof and the problem cases are fictitious.

Dr.-Ing. Giok Dijen Go
Pfeilgrabenstr. 4c
D-6510 Idstein
Germany

Ref. to US 5,257,854 a device, invented to protect a womb or foetus, comprises

- a) a seat-cushion cover, on which a female belt user sits, loosely resting on the seat cushion 3.1, and
- b) a connector, connecting the mid-portion of the seat-cushion cover to the lap belt portion 1.3 of three-point seat belt.

Unfortunately, no agencies in the world approve motor vehicles with such equipment, thus resulting in bankruptcy of the car corporations, due to the following deficiencies, infeasibility and inapplicability:

- F1. Since the introduction of three-point seat belts by Volvo Corp., at first in USA and Sweden in about 1962 a great number of wombs and/or foetuses of pregnant female belt users have been destroyed because no motor vehicle is equipped therewith. The destruction thereof would be reported in newspapers and at televisions and incur US-law suits, compensatory damages of, totally, over one billion of dollars over four decades and the bankruptcy of all car corps. This is solid evidence for the problem cases, which are fictitious.
- F2. Despite closely working with experts of FAA, NTSB, NHSTA, Canadian Transport, IIHS, EU, Police and Prosecutors the inventor has never read in any court-file or expert-report the destruction thereof in the event of abrupt braking. In such an event the inertia force of the female passenger is negligible due to the maximum braking deceleration of less than 10 m²/s. Porsche's ceramic braking system has a far higher one. When abrupt braking the belt retractor jams the extending belt portion and the body of the belt user can *only* be thrown forwards by great kinetic energy while the lap belt portion remains in the same position. In accidents the shoulder belt portion under load of great belt force fractures not womb, but lung, heart, aorta etc., listed in medical reports, while the belt retractor retracts the seat belt by about 30 cm.
For sure, the upward movement of the lap belt portion as well as the principle object don't comply with Technical Mechanics.
- F3. Should we, Mechanical Engineers, consult David Copperfield how to move upwards the lap belt portion in the event of abrupt **braking**. The **greatest** nonsense is written in US 5,257,854!
- F4. According to the principle object of invention that device, being put into operation, prevents the lap belt portion from moving upwards to the womb of the female belt user in the event of abrupt (rapid) **braking**, but **not** submarining! The goal thereof has nothing to do with the prevention of submarining!
- F5. The connector is a metal **buckle** with open profile, which is broken by large belt force, listed in Table 1. Another connector comprises male and female elements, which are in a releasable snap connection. This has nothing to do with the common plug-in connection of a conventional **latch plate** with a conventional **buckle assembly**. In the event of abrupt braking and then accelerating again the foldable, lightweight seat-cushion, which is foldable, moves around, making the pregnant belt user feel uncomfortable and distracting her from the traffic.
- F6. In accidents the belt users are forced to move at first in the direction of their respective inertia forces and, within milli-seconds, finally in the direction of their respective kinetic energies. Due to the foldable property the seat-cushion covers are folded. Due to lack of energy absorbers the seat belts, greatly elongating, fail to restrain the belt users, particularly when they are obese. See Chap. D4 regarding great elongation resulting in the ejection of the child out of the Toyota Yaris and the 90 kg-heavy driver of the AUDI A6 freeing himself out of the restraint.
- F7. Because the seats of a five-seat car, equipped with seat-cushion covers, are suited for fat women, beautiful, slender film stars must stay at their hotel until ones with the proper size, if available, and the seat cushions are purchased and installed therein. During which time the car stays idle at the hotel parking lot and the film festival goes on without them. Definitely, they sue the car corp.

Dr.-Ing. Gök Djen Gök
Pfahlgrabenstr. 45 /
D-65510 Idstein
Germany

- F8. The principle object of invention discriminates millions of obese women from the normal ones. When taking seats they, wholly covering the respective female elements of connectors, can never use the devices.
- F9. The principle object of the invention discriminates against millions of women wearing long gowns. How can they use the devices?
- F10. The principle object of invention discriminates against millions of slim women. Their worms or foetuses are destroyed when they under great force slam into the connectors and lap belts.
- F11. In another embodiment the rear portion of seat-cushion cover is fastened to the seat backrest by a pair of straps, looping around thereto and having ends, attached to male and female fasteners, in order to prevent the seat-cushion cover from moving forwards. Great inertia force of a 160 kg-heavy female belt user or her kinetic energy rips those straps off.
- F12. Despite being fastened to the seat backrest, the foldable, lightweight seat-cushion, being foldable, moves backwards and/or sideways, just like in roller coasters, in dependence on the movement of the belt user.
- F13. An A380 with 600 seats and a five-seat car have to be provided with 3000 and 25 seat-cushion covers and seat cushions for five different sizes of obese, fat, normal-size, slim and slender women. When all male passengers use the seat belts 3000 or 25 cushion covers must be put away and stored. As a result, money, personnel and time must be spent on purchasing, administrating, collecting, storing and transporting them.
- F14. Ford Corp. has recalled 1.4 million brand-new motor vehicles due to the unreliability of the plug-in connection of latch plate with buckle assembly, both of which are standard parts manufactured by the renown supplier TRW! The seat-cushion cover, releasable snap connection and straps have to undergo lengthy, expensive testing and certification for reliability during normal use and in the event of abrupt braking as well as in real-world accidents.

Thank you for your attention in advance.

Kind regards

Go

Attached:

Substitute and marked-up appls with footnote 300705.

7 replacement sheets and seven annotated marked-up sheets.

The PTO did not receive the following
listed item(s) Drawing